

## **REMARKS**

In response to the final Office Action dated September 27, 2012, the Assignee respectfully requests continued examination and reconsideration based on the above amendments and on the following remarks.

Claims 1 and 5-14 are pending in this application. Claims 15-51 have been, or previously were, canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

### **Rejection of Claims 1 & 7-14 under § 103 (a)**

The Office rejected claims 1 and 7-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over newly cited U.S. Patent 6,317,884 to Eames, *et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent 6,005,861 to Humpleman, and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,890,168 to Inoue, *et al.*

This rejection, though, is mistaken. The Examiner has, with great respect, misinterpreted the newly-cited document to *Eames*. When *Eames* is correctly interpreted, the proposed combination of *Eames* with *Humpleman* and *Inoue* still fails to teach or suggest all the features of the pending claims. One of ordinary skill in the art, then, would not think that claims 1 and 7-14 are obvious.

*Eames* has been misinterpreted. The Examiner contends that *Eames* teaches “multiple pairs of a tuner and a demodulator” connected to a shared system bus, as independent claim 1 recites. The Examiner specifically contends that *Eames*’s “TV modules,” as illustrated in *Eames*’s FIG. 6, are equivalent to the “multiple pairs of a tuner and a demodulator” recited by independent claim 1.

This contention, though, is NOT what *Eames* teaches. While *Eames* does describe “TV modules,” there is absolutely no teaching of these TV modules being “pairs of a tuner and a

*demodulator.*” Indeed, when these “TV modules” are correctly understood, one of ordinary skill understands that *Eames*’s TV modules are not “*pairs of a tuner and a demodulator.*”

For example, the Examiner cites to *Eames*’ column 6, line 65 through column 7, line 15. These paragraphs are reproduced below, for the Examiner’s convenience:

FIG. 6 illustrates a gateway 200 which can be used in homes where there is point-to-point in-home coaxial cable wiring, and where the gateway can be located near the point where the coaxial wiring originates.

The gateway 200 shown in FIG. 6 has an main MPEG processor 430 which is capable of decompressing multiple MPEG streams. In a preferred embodiment, main MPEG processor 430 can decompress three video streams simultaneously, and generates three S-video signals which are available on S-video bus 620. **The TV modules 654 can receive any of the S-video signals from S-video bus 620, and modulate the video signal onto an appropriate channel for reception by a television which is connected to that TV module 654 via coaxial cable and TV connector 630.**

An RF pass-through 464 and CATV module 480 are used to map off-air broadcast or CATV signals to S-video, which can subsequently be transmitted to any of the televisions connected to TV connectors 630 or S-video connector 474.

See U.S. Patent 6,317,884 to *Eames, et al.*, at column 6, line 65 through column 7, line 15 (emphasis added). Here *Eames* explains that these “TV modules” receive S-video signals from an “S-video bus.” These S-video signals are generated by an MPEG processor 430. Even though these TV modules then “modulate” the S-video signals, there is no teaching or suggestion that *Eames*’s TV modules are “*pairs of a tuner and a demodulator,*” as recited by independent claim 1. Indeed, because *Eames*’s TV modules “receive ... S-video signals” from a bus, there is no need for *Eames*’s TV modules to perform any “*tuner*” operations.

For this reason, then, the Examiner has misinterpreted *Eames*’s teachings. When *Eames*’s TV modules are correctly understood, one of ordinary skill understands that *Eames*’s TV modules are not “*pairs of a tuner and a demodulator.*” The proposed combination of *Eames*

with *Humpleman* and *Inoue* thus still fails to teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. One of ordinary skill in the art, then, would not think that independent claim 1 is obvious.

Moreover, independent claim 1 recites even more distinguishing features. Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that “each pair of the tuner and the demodulator tuning to a frequency to receive a plurality of information signals” (emphasis added). As the above paragraph explains, *Eames* with *Humpleman* and *Inoue* teaches “TV modules” that “receive S-video signals” from an “S-video bus.” The proposed combination of *Eames* with *Humpleman* and *Inoue* wholly fails to teach or suggest any “tuning to a frequency.” Again, as *Eames*’s TV modules already “receive ... S-video signals” generated by an MPEG processor, there is no need to perform any “tuning to a frequency.” Because *Eames* with *Humpleman* and *Inoue* is silent to these additional features, one of ordinary skill in the art would not think that independent claim 1 is obvious.

Yet independent claim 1 recites still more distinguishing features. Independent claim 1 has been amended to further clarify that “each pair of the tuner and the demodulator ... receiv[ing] a plurality of information signals broadcast from a source” (emphasis added). Because *Eames* with *Humpleman* and *Inoue* teaches “TV modules” that “receive S-video signals” from an “S-video bus,” the proposed combination fails to teach or suggest any reception “of information signals broadcast from a source” (emphasis added). Again, as *Eames*’s TV modules already “receive ... S-video signals” generated by an MPEG processor, there is no need to “tun[e] to a frequency” to “receive ... signals broadcast from a source” (emphasis added). Because *Eames* with *Humpleman* and *Inoue* is silent to these additional features, one of ordinary skill in the art would not think that independent claim 1 is obvious.

Claims 1 and 7-14, then, cannot be obvious over *Eames* with *Humpleman* and *Inoue*. Independent claim 1 recites many distinguishing features, and the dependent claims incorporate these distinguishing features and recite even more features. One of ordinary skill in the art, then,

would not think that these claims are obvious. The Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

**Rejection of Claims 5-6 under § 103 (a)**

The Office rejected claims 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over *Eames* with *Humpleman* and *Inoue* and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,732,366 to Russo.

These claims, though, cannot be obvious. Claims 5-6 depend from independent claim 1. As the above paragraphs explained, *Eames* with *Humpleman* and *Inoue* fails to teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. The additional teachings of *Russo* do not cure the deficiencies. One of ordinary skill in the art, then, would not think that claims 5-6 are obvious. The Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

---

If any questions arise, the Examiner is invited contact the undersigned at (919) 469-2629 or [scott@scottzimmerman.com](mailto:scott@scottzimmerman.com).

**37 C.F.R. § 1.8 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted via the USPTO EFS web interface on December 7, 2012.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Scott P. Zimmerman', is written over a light, circular, textured background.

Scott P. Zimmerman  
Attorney for the Assignee  
Reg. No. 41,390